UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,196	05/01/2001	Irit Haviv-Segal	2261/4	2558

7590   07/10/2003

DR. MARK FRIEDMAN LTD.
c/o BILL POLKINGHORN - DISCOVERY DISPATCH
9003 FLORIN WAY
UPPER MALBORO, MD   20772

EXAMINER
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/845,196	HAVIV-SEGAL ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Srirama Channavajjala	2177

-- Th *MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sh et with the correspondence address* --

Period f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 May 2001_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings <u>are objected</u> to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 as

indicated in the form PTO-948, paper no. # 6, formal drawings are required in response

to this office action, paper no. # 6.

Priority

2.   Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

based on 60/199,008 filed on 4/19/2000 and 60/226,694 filed on 8/22/2000

Specification

3.   It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior

Application No. 60/199,008, 60/226,694, filed 4/19/2000 & 8/22/2000. ***A reference to***

the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification of

this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely

on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120. See 37 CFR

1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, the reference must include the

relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional

applications. Also, the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications

referenced should be included.

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or

after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be

submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months

from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the

prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the

national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000,

after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during

the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on

which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months

from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This

time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C.

119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of

any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A

priority claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by

a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the

reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the

prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t),

and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37

CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The

Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay

was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition,

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1- 3,9,15-17, 21,rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Biffar, US Patent No. 6397212.

5.   As to Claims 1,15-17,20-21 Biffar teaches a system which including 'knowledge

acquision from electronic databases' [fig 1, col 1, line 9-11], knowledge acquision from

electronic databases corresponds to Biffar's fig 1, knowledge search engine, 'filtering

engine for analyzing smart search results, such that relevant information fragments are

gagged according to professional terminology and content specific cues' [see Abstract,

col 5, line 49-62], Biffar specifically teaches searching across multiple web sites for

specific information from the databases, further items are being tagged based on the

keywords as detailed in col 5, line 49-62], filtering engine corresponds to Biffar's search

engine, relevant information fragments corresponds to tags from various web sites,

professional terminology corresponds to keywords as detailed in col 5, line 49-62,

'mapping engine for allocating said relevant information fragments, provided by said

filtering engine, to knowledge nodes, thereby enabling the virtual creation of content

files' [col 5, line 64-67, col 6, line 1-3], Biffar specifically teaches for example

presentation module that have all the search results are presented to the user, 'content

editing tool for enabling a human content editor to create a database of said smart

search results, and categorizing unmapped said information fragments on said

knowledge nodes, such that a modular structure of knowledge is formed' [col 6, line 44-

64], Biffar specifically teaches for example user to select, enter various information to

suite to the requirements, further users to rate the search results, also users have ability

to choose rating function for different searches or methods that corresponds to human

content editor to create information into the database, smart search results corresponds

to Biffar's figs 4-6, 'a content oriented database system for storing said content files'

[fig 1-2], content files are integral part of item database, further Biffar specifically display

at least one content file information as detailed in fig 2, , said database of smart search

results' [fig 4], Biffar specifically teaches for example search and search results as

detailed in fig 4, smart search results corresponds to Biffar's fig 4, 'a database of

pointers to paragraphs, a database of said modular structure of knowledge' [col 8, line

48-56], 'an hierarchy of professional terminologies according to word groups in a

specific field of knowledge' [col 5, line 1-5, col 10, line 36-49, line 62-65, fig 6], hierarchy

of professional terminologies according to word groups corresponds to fig 6, 'a user

interface for enabling user interaction with said content oriented database system, such

that said user can navigate within said modular structure using outlines' [col 7, line 36-

41, fig 5], Biffar specifically directed to user interface in which user to enter required

information for searching databases, further it provides additional information for users

to allow to purchase, add products electronic shopping cart as detailed in fig 5

6.   As to Claim 2, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Biffar disclosed 'pre-analysis of texts by said filtering engine

and said mapping engine' [col 6, line 15-24, col 7, line 48-54].

7.   As to Claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 1 above. In addition, Biffar disclosed 'server system for serving said content files

to users' [col 10, line 59-61, fig 1], Biffar specifically suggests for example database are

distributed over a network and connected to each other.

8.   As to Claim 9, Biffar disclosed 'allowing the user to create modular structure of

knowledge inclusive of personal terms, synonyms and hierarchy' [fig 4, col 10, line 36-

49], 'allocating a personal content oriented database to store said modular structure of

knowledge and information sources' [col 9, line 46-55], 'enabling the user to view

personal content files from said personal content oriented database' [col 12, line 54-62],

'enabling the user to compose explanatory outlines' [col 12, line 63-67, col 13, line 1-6].

9.   As to Claim 18-19, Biffar teaches a system which including 'initial database level

for storing original content from information sources' [col 4, line 14-25, fig 1], 'a

processor for filtering and mapping said original content into content fragments' [col 5,

line 49-62,col 65-67, col 6, line 1-3], 'a table system for storing said links to content

fragments processed by said processor, such that said table system contains pointers

to said content fragments and said original content' [col 5, line 49-62, col 8, line 48-56,

col 10, line 36-49, col 62-65, fig 6]

10.   As to Claim 21, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claims above. In addition, Biffar teaches 'content provider to bill said user according to

specific nodes that were clicked by said user' [col 3, line 30-35], Biffar specifically

teaches building user profile and similar users, further Biffar's search engine(s) are

based on self-learning and self-personalizing knowledge search engine that produces

required results using commercial search engines because these search engines are

primary used for example electronic shopping, flight reservation and like as detailed in

col 4, line 34-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11.   Claim 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a & b) as being anticipated by Kanaegami et al., [hereafter Kanaegami], US Patent No. 5297039.

12.   As to Claim 11, Kanaegami teaches a system which including 'identifying keywords that are related to a content specific field of knowledge' [see Abstract, col 4, line 49-57, col 9, line 53-63, fig 6], Kanaegami is directed to text search system for locating on the basis of keyword matching and keyword relationship matching, more specifically text information extraction, similarity matching using knowledge database, further Kanaegami also teaches query analysis using keywords, establishing relationship between various words or elements of keyword as detailed in table 3, 'enhancing each said keyword with alternative terms for conveying said keyword's idea' [col 9, line 57-67, col 10, line 1-5], Kanaegami specifically teaches analyzing each keyword and their relationships between various elements, it is also noted that Kanaegami suggests alternative terms that are equivalent match such as detailed in col 12, line 1-21, 'placing said terms within a table system that assigns every node which conveys a professional idea to a table of word groups, such that a table of paragraphs is allocated to each said professional idea' [col 12, line 35-59,col 14, line 8-10, table 9A-9B], Kanaegami specifically teaches various tables that related to query analysis, more specifically extracting input sentence or keyword from database or

PDB and converted into complemented analysis and establishing relations between

various elements as detailed in table 9A-9B.

13.   As to Claim 12-13, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 11 above. In addition, Kanaegami disclosed 'creating a collection of sources that

deal with a content specific field of knowledge' [see fig 6], collection of sources

corresponds to text database element 30 and 90, content specific field of knowledge

corresponds to text, abstracts, publication information related to patent, 'extracting

professional terminology from said collection' [see Table 9A-9B], especifcally relation

between various elements is part of extracting terminology from the collection,

'clustering extracted said professional terms into cluster of meanings in a node table'

[col 14, line 63-67], Kanaegami specifically suggests for example collecting all related

information such as synonym and near synonym in to dictionary or SD, 'defining

resulting clusters into word groups, which are placed in a word group table for enabling

matching of said word groups to said nodes during user searches' [col 15, line 1-15],

'organizing a hierarchical relationship in said node table, according to the order of

appearance of said terminology in said texts' [col 16, line 7-24], 'providing a processor

with filtering software, coupled to said paragraph table for filtering relevant information

fragments in said paragraph table' [col 7, line 63-67, col 8, line 1-13, line 37-42, fig 2],

'providing mapping software for allocating said relevant fragments to at least one node

in a node table, such that every paragraph is linked to said node table' [col 15, line 26-

44], 'in case where said fragments cannot be assigned to said node table, sending said

fragments to an expert, to define a new node and said new node's position in said node

table' [col 17, line 19-43].

14.   As to Claim 14, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 12-13 above. In addition, Kanaegami disclosed 'search for a word group using

an existing search mechanism' [col 4, line 41-51].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15.   Claims 4-8,10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Biffar, US Patent No. 6397212 as applied to claim1, above, and further in view of

Kanaegami et al., [hereafter Kanaegami], US Patent No. 5297039.

16.   As to Claim 4, 6, Biffar teaches a system which including 'tagging, knowledge

using professional terms' [col 5, line 58-62], it is however noted that Biffar does not

specifically teach 'breaking up information sources into paragraph, identify relevant

paragraphs'. On the other hand, Kanaegami disclosed 'breaking up information

sources into paragraph, identify relevant paragraphs' [see Abstract, col 18, line 64-67,

col 19, line 1-14].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the teaching of Kanaegami et al into self learning and self

personalizing knowledge search engine that delivers holistic results of Biffar because

both are directed to search engines, and more specifically both are directed to

knowledge base search engines [see Kanaegami: Abstract, fig 6; Biffar: fig 1, Abstract,

col 1, line 8-11] and both are directed to querying and retrieving from knowledge based

databases and are both from the same field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the references

because that would have allowed users of Biffar's self learning and self personalizing

knowledge search engine that delivers holistic results to specifically search and retrieve

relevant paragraph(s) or text(s) satisfies his or her query as suggested by Kanaegami

[co 4, line 49-66], thus improving semantic similarity analysis of text search.

17.   As to Claim 5, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 4 above. In addition, Kanaegami disclosed 'content specific field of knowledge'

[fig 2], content specific field of knowledge corresponds to Kanaegami's fig 2.

18.   As to Claim 7-8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

Claim 4 above. In addition Kanaegami and Biffar both teach user interface in which

user enters query or search [see Kanaegami: Abstract; Biffar: Abstract, fig 2-4], further

Biffar specifically suggests 'displayed on an output device in a multiple windows

window' [see fig 4, fig 5, col 7, line 36-41].

        As to Claim 10, Biffar disclosed 'an initial document table, that includes source

from a specific professional field of knowledge' [fig 6A], col 11, line 3-12], 'node table

that includes variety of ideas in a content specific field of knowledge, such that said

ideas are arranged from more general ideas on the top nodes to very specific node on

the bottom nodes, using hierarchical relations' [col 5, line 1-8,col 10, line 36-49]. On the

other hand, Kanaegami teaches 'paragraph includes pointers to tagged paragraphs

within said document table' [col 7, line 63-67, col 8, line 1-13, line 37-42, fig 2], 'word

group table that includes a collection of professional terms that define every idea within

said node table' [fig 6,col 21,line 24-39].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	6397212
b.	US Patent No.	5297039

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

c.	US Patent No.	6038560
d.	US Patent No.	6256627
e.	US Patent No.	5444823
f.	US Patent No.	5720001
g.	US Patent No.	6510406
h.	US Patent No	6430558
i.	US Patent No	5933818
j.	US Patent No	6523026
k.	US Patent No	6304872
l.	US Patent No	6112202

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	**(After Final Communication)**
703/746-7239	**(Offical Communications)**
703/746-7240	**(For Status inquiries, draft communication)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

sc
Patent Examiner.
July 8, 2003.